

CA2 ALAE 44
1975C57
c.2

ALBERTA LEGISLATURE LIBRARY



3 3398 00451 9210

COMMUNITY SCHOOL COORDINATOR TRIAL PROJECT:

AN EVALUATION

LIBRARY
VAULT 19

by

Daniel L. Maloney
Planning and Research Services
Advanced Education and Manpower
Edmonton, Alberta
July, 1975

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026 with funding from
Legislative Assembly of Alberta - Alberta Legislature Library

Table of Contents

COMMUNITY SCHOOL COORDINATOR TRIAL PROJECT:

	Page
Introduction to the Trial Project AN EVALUATION	1
Background History	1
Purpose and Objectives of the Trial Project	2
Organization	3
The Three Schools and Their Communities	4
Evaluation	4
Methodology	5
Results of the Lordburg Survey	8
Results of Cross-Tabulation	10
Results of the Pincher Creek Survey	12
Comments on Rural Sample	16
Results of Cross-Tabulation	16
Results of the St. Paul Survey	15
Results of Cross-Tabulation	17
Observations	17
Conclusions	18
Recommendations	19
Appendix A. Descriptions used in Survey	24
Appendix B. Results of the Community Survey	27
Bibliography	27

Daniel L. Maloney
 Planning and Research Services
 Advanced Education and Manpower
 Edmonton, Alberta
 July, 1975

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction to the Community School Concept	1
Background History	1
Purpose and Objectives of the Trial Project	2
Organization	3
The Three Schools and Their Communities	4
Evaluation	4
Methodology	5
Results of the Hardisty Survey	8
Results of Cross-Tabulation	10
Results of the Pincher Creek Survey	12
Comments on Rural Sample	14
Results of Cross-Tabulation	14
Results of the St. Paul Survey	15
Results of Cross-Tabulation	17
Observations	17
Conclusions	18
Recommendations	19
Appendix A. Questionnaires used in Surveys	24
Appendix A. Results of the Community Surveys	32
Bibliography	47

Table of Contents	
Page	
i	Introduction to the Community School Concept
ii	Background History
iii	Purpose and Objectives of the Trial Project
iv	Organization
v	The Three Schools and Their Committees
vi	Evaluation
vii	Methodology
viii	Results of the Trial Project
ix	Results of Cross-Tabulation
x	Results of the Pinchot Survey
xi	Comments on Rural
xii	Results of Cross-Tabulation
xiii	Results of the St. Paul Survey
xiv	Results of Cross-Tabulation
xv	Observations
xvi	Conclusions
xvii	Recommendations
xviii	Appendix A: Questionnaire used in Survey
xix	Appendix B: Results of the Community School Survey
xx	Bibliography

Introduction to the Community School Concept

Adult participation in after hours courses, programs, or events (i.e. after 3:30 p.m. when the traditional school day ends, or on week-ends) has been increasing significantly in the past decade in Alberta. Adult participation is one of the most visible components of a Community School.

Simply stated, a Community School can be defined as a complete integration of the community and the school, so that the previous boundaries for each are no longer clearly distinguishable. This is characterized by the community utilizing school facilities, classrooms, shops, gymnasias, meeting rooms, etc., while the school makes use of community facilities such as libraries, art galleries, museums, planetariums and the like, as a learning resource.

Background History

In the past nine years there has been two legislative changes which facilitated the creation of a Community School. The first occurred in 1966, when changes in the Recreation Development Act, the Municipal Government Act, and the School Act, were made to allow for the joint use of community facilities. Basically, the change in legislation allowed local Recreation Boards and the School Boards to enter into an agreement which provided for reciprocal use of facilities. For example the School Board could use the local curling rink, if it had not been previously booked, and similarly the Recreation Board could use the gymnasium of a local school if it were not in use.

The second legislative change occurred in 1971, when the Department of Education adopted a policy of giving credit for work experience to high school students.

With these two steps the groundwork for the integration of the community and the school had been laid. It was felt that this integration could be best achieved if a person in the school were designated as a

community-school director or coordinator. This person would act largely as a facilitator, determining community needs and arranging suitable ways of satisfying those needs. Also, he would arrange to have the school actively participate in, and study about the community. This could be achieved through such activities as: work experience programs, field trips, and outdoor education programs.

To this end, in 1972 three Provincial Departments: the Department of Education, the then Department of Advanced Education, now, Department of Advanced Education and Manpower, and the then Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation now, the Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife, jointly agreed to fund a Community School Coordinator Trial Project.

These three Departments were to work cooperatively with the local School Board and Recreation Board in establishing a community School.

The trial project was to last for a period of three years. Each year the three Departments (Government) would contribute \$7,000 toward the salary and associated costs of a Community School Coordinator. The local hosting authorities (School Board and Recreation Board) were to jointly match the Government's contribution of \$7,000 per annum. Thus, producing a total of \$14,000 per annum to go toward the salary and associated costs of a Community School Coordinator.

PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE TRIAL PROJECT

Specifically the purpose of the Community School Coordinator, as set out by the funding parties, was too:

encourage the use of, and involvement in,
the schools by the community, and the use
of, and involvement in the community, by
the schools.

It was recommended that the Coordinator be a member of the teaching staff, but only teach a half load. The remainder of his time would be devoted to the duties associated with the position of coordinator. By being a member of the teaching staff the Coordinator could better effect participation of his colleagues and students in the Community School Project.

Five objectives were set out by the Provincial Steering Committee for the project:

1. Community involvement in determining school curriculum;
2. School involvement in studying in and about the community;
3. Community use of school facilities;
4. School use of community facilities;
5. Creating a favourable community disposition toward the school.

These objectives could be arranged in whatever order of priority desired by each of the local Steering Committees.

ORGANIZATION

At the provincial level there is a Provincial Steering Committee which acts as the central body for decision making, recommendations, and evaluation procedures for the Project. This committee is comprised of representatives from the Department of Education, Department of Advanced Education and Manpower, Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife, Faculty of Recreation University of Alberta, Faculty of Education University of Alberta, Alberta Teachers' Association, Edmonton Parks and Recreation, Alberta Recreation and Parks Association, Alberta School Trustees' Association, the three Community School Coordinators plus the Chairman from each of the Local Steering Committees.

At the local level there is a Local Steering Committee. This committee is responsible for the implementation of any policy guidelines as set out by the Provincial Steering committee. It must ensure that attempts are made to satisfy the particular needs of its community and to suggest new courses or activities which the Community School could offer. It also establishes priorities for the Community School.

The Local Steering Committee is made up of representatives from Preventative Social Services, the Recreation Board, the Public School Board, Department of Advanced Education and Manpower, the local Further Education Council, Alberta School Trustees' Association, the local Home Economist, interested citizens and a representative from the student body.

The Coordinator is accountable directly to the Local Steering Committee. He gives a monthly report to the Local Steering Committee on the events and activities of the Community School.

THE THREE SCHOOLS AND THEIR COMMUNITIES

Hardisty Junior High School in Edmonton was the first school to have a designated Community School Coordinator under the terms of the Trial Project. This arrangement began in September 1972 and ended in June 1975.

Hardisty Junior High is located in southeast Edmonton. It serves over 900 students in Grades VII, VIII, and IX. The Hardisty Community is actually made up of six smaller communities; Capilano, Gold Bar, Fulton Place, Forest Heights, Holyrood and Terrace Heights. Its population approaches 30,000 residents.

The Coordinator selected for Hardisty had previously taught in Edmonton. At Hardisty he taught a reduced load. He was not a resident of the Hardisty Community as outlined above.

Matthew Halton High School in Pincher Creek and St. Paul Reginal High School in St. Paul entered an arrangement similar to Hardisty in September 1973. The expiry date of the Trial Project at these two schools is June 1976.

Pincher Creek is located in south-western Alberta, it has a town population of slightly more than 3,000 with another 3,000 residents in the surrounding rural area. Matthew Halton serves over 700 students in Grades X, XI, and XII.

The Coordinator selected for Matthew Halton High School had previously been the Vice-Principal of that school. In fact, while he was the Coordinator he continued to be the Vice-Principal. Due to this situation his teaching load was substantially reduced from the normal load. The Coordinator was a resident of Pincher Creek.

St. Paul is located 125 miles north-east of Edmonton. It has a population of 3,3000 people. The St. Paul Regional High serves 550 students in Grades X, XI, and XII. The Coordinator selected for St. Paul Regional High was a resident and had previously taught in St. Paul. He had a reduced teaching load also, which allowed him time to carry out the duties of a coordinator.

EVALUATION

As well as the monthly reports the Community School Coordinator prepares an annual report for the Local Steering Committee on the events and activities of the Community School. The Community School Coordinators present their

annual report, to the Provincial Steering Committee as well. Also, members of the Local Steering Committee are annually invited to submit individual written evaluations of the Community School Project.

The Provincial Steering Committee felt however, that evaluation should go beyond this internal mechanism, and consequently recommended that an external evaluation be conducted for all three Community Schools. It was decided that Planning and Research Services of the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower conduct the external evaluation.

The objective of the external evaluation was to ascertain community awareness of the Community School Coordinator, and community awareness of the community School itself. Furthermore it was to ascertain the community attitude toward the Community School concept. Finally, it was to determine the participation rate of the community residents in programs, courses, events, offered by the Community Schools.

METHODOLOGY

A questionnaire was designed by Planning and Research Services. Basically the instrument was the same for all three communities, however slight modifications were made at the request of Local Steering Committees to reflect the unique flavour of the individual Community Schools.

A pre-test was conducted in the Hardisty Community. The results showed that the basic instrument was suitable for use without major modifications.

For the Hardisty survey, a 10% simple random sample of households was taken with no provision for replacement. This 10% figure represents 453 households. In Pincher Creek and St. Paul it was possible to conduct a larger percentage survey because of the relatively smaller populations. Therefore a 20% simple random sample of households was used with no provision for replacement. This 20% figure represents 150 households in St. Paul; 140 households in Pincher Creek.

Attempts to locate a common source for a sampling frame in the three communities were unsuccessful. Consequently different sources were used in all three communities. However, it is felt that the results were basically the same, namely; obtaining a list of all the households in the community.

In Edmonton, the City of Edmonton Census of 1973 was used to obtain a list of all households in the Hardisty area. In Pincher Creek, the 1975 Provincial Election Voters List was used, while in St. Paul the Town's Property Taxation file was consulted.

A short questionnaire (see Appendix A) was administered to any (one) resident of the household eighteen years of age or older. The interviewers were instructed to aim at an equal representation of male/female respondents. In all cases the interviewers were students of the respective Community School. Few interviewers had any previous interviewing experience. Orientation sessions were held, in which interviewing methods and techniques were explained to the students.

The interviewers from Hardisty Junior High were somewhat younger than the interviewers from the other two schools. Their task was a bit more taxing than their rural counterparts since they had considerably more interviews to conduct. However, all concerned did a competent job.

In the Hardisty Community there were 301 responses out of a possible 453. This is a 66% response rate. The sex representation was highly disproportionate, 71% female and 28% male. This bias must be considered when analyzing the survey results. There was a fair representation from each of the four age groups, with 16.3% in the 18-24 age group, 28.9% in the 25-39 age group, 25.2% in the 40-59 age group, and 19.6% in the over 60 age group.

In Pincher Creek there were 123 responses out of a possible 140, which is an 88% response rate. Twenty-three of the 140 households were in the rural area. The Local Steering Committee wanted rural representation in the survey to determine the attitude and awareness of the rural people toward the Community School.

The sex representation was 39.8% male and 59.3% female. There was over representation in the older two age groups; 7.3% in the 18-24 group, 16.3% in the 25-39 group, 39.0% in the 40-59 group, and 28.5% in the over 60 group. That is, 67.5% of the respondents were in the 40 years and older age group.

In St. Paul there were 129 responses out of a possible 150, which is an 86% response rate. The male/female representation was; 43.4% male, 54.3% female. The 2.3% no response rate for sex may be explained by novice interviewers. There was over representation in the two older age categories;

7.0% in the 18-24 group, 27.1% in the 25-39 group, 35.7% in the 40-59 group, and 23.3% in the over 60 group. That is, 59% of the respondents were 40 years of age and older.

HARDISTY COMMUNITY SCHOOL

RESULTS OF THE HARDISTY SURVEY

From the data collected, the Hardisty Community can be termed middle class. Almost half (46.5%) of the respondents reported an annual gross family income in the range of \$10,000 to \$20,000. This is significantly higher than the Provincial average of one in three families (33%) falling in the same income range. One in four (25.2%) reported an annual gross family income exceeding \$20,000. This is five times greater than the provincial average of one family in twenty (5%).

With respect to education, 92.7% of the sample had successfully completed a minimum of Grade IX, which is almost double the 50% provincial average. Over one-fifth of the sample had successfully completed a minimum of one year of university of college, this is almost three times the 7% average for the Province.

The average family size of 3.4 members is slightly smaller than the Provincial average of 3.7 members.

Generally, it can be said that the typical family in the Hardisty community has a higher than average income, better than average education, and a slightly smaller than average family size.

Regarding the Trial Project, 30.3% of the respondents indicated they had heard of the Hardisty Community School Project. Of these, 35%* were familiar enough with the Project to be able to specifically recall a program, event, or activity which had been offered by/in the Community School.

Area 13 News, a community publication, was identified by 37.9%* of the respondents as the primary source of learning about the Project. The second most popular source was through a son or daughter (12.4%)

A little more than one in four (27%)* of those aware of the Community School were aware that there was a Community School Coordinator at Hardisty. Some 14.4% could personally name him.

When the respondents were asked who they would contact to participate in a program, event, or activity at the Community School, two out of three (66.4%)* gave no response. This high "no response" rate can be attributed to two things; one, no desire to participate in activities at the Community School or, two; simply no idea at all of whom to contact to participate in activities. Less than one-fourth (24%)* indicated they would contact the school.

*Throughout the remainder of the report an asterisk denotes Adjusted Frequency (i.e. Relative Frequency - Not Applicable = Adjusted Frequency)

Slightly more than one in four persons (26.2%)* aware of the Trial Project participated in a program, event, or activity at Hardisty Community School. When those who hadn't participated were asked if there was any particular reason for not doing so, the most often cited reason was "no time" or that their shift work interfered with regular attendance at programs.

The number one priority for Hardisty Community School established by the Local Steering committee was to involve the community in determining school curriculum. When questioned, 63.5%* of the respondents favoured parents or other adult members of the community determining to some extent, school policies and activities.

When the residents were asked what new programs they would like to have at Hardisty Community School there was a very high no response rate - 61%*. Again, this high "no response" rate can be attributed to two things: one, no interest in programs offered by the Community School; two, unfamiliarity with the programs presently being offered and consequently a reluctance to respond to the question lest they suggest a program which in fact is already being offered. However 18.4%* suggested sports or other fitness related activities, while the second most frequent suggestion was for Crafts and Ceramics (8.5%).

There were three attitudinal questions on a seven point scale in the instrument. The points ranged from (1) strongly opposed, through (4) undecided, to (7) strongly in favour.

The first of these questions was to measure the community attitude toward Hardisty Community School. One half of the respondents (52.9%) were strongly in favour of the Community School, with 35.9% choosing (7). There was a large number (21.9%) who selected (4) undecided, and 14.6% with "no response". This suggests that over one-third (36.5%) of the respondents are not sufficiently familiar with the Community School to have either a positive or negative attitude toward the school.

The second question, which measured community attitude about the community use of school facilities demonstrates strong support for the idea of community use of school facilities. Almost seven out of ten respondents (69.4%) strongly favoured community use of facilities, with 47.8% choosing (7). There was a large

number (21.9%) who selected (4) undecided, and 14.6% with "no response". This suggests that over one-third (36.5%) of the respondents are not sufficiently familiar with the Community School to have either a positive or negative attitude toward the school.

The second question, which measured community attitude about the community use of school facilities demonstrates strong support for the idea of community use of school facilities. Almost seven out of ten respondents (69.4%) strongly favoured community use of facilities, with 47.8% choosing (7).

The community attitude was strongest in support of field trips for students, 79.1% strongly favoured field trips, with 62.8% choosing (7). A follow up question to determine how far the residents were willing to extend these field trips showed that 42.3% agreed to trips beyond the Province; 31.2% agreed to trips within the Province; and only 15.9% felt that the trips should be limited to the City of Edmonton.

There was an extremely high "no response" rate (72.8%) to an open ended question which asked the respondents what they liked about Hardisty Community School. Again, this may be interpreted that the residents are not sufficiently familiar with the Community School to be able to comment on what they like about it. Almost one in five (17.3%) however, mentioned that they liked the idea of greater use of the school facilities by the community.

There was also a large "no response" rate (69.1%) to another open ended question which asked the residents what they disliked about Hardisty Community School. Again this can be attributed to lack of familiarity with the Community School operation. The one major dislike of the residents (17.9%) was the Drop-in Centre. Many residents felt that there was not adequate supervision of the people attending the Drop-in Centre.

There were predictable results in a question to determine suitable times and days to participate in programs. Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday evenings were the most popular times.

RESULTS OF CROSS-TABULATION

There were only a few tables which had significant relationships. One was gross family income by attitude about community use of school facilities (99% confidence level). It shows that the greater the income the more favourable the attitude toward the community use of school facilities.

The other table which had a significant relationship (99% confidence level) was, grade completed by attitude about community use of school facilities. It

showed that the higher the grade completed the more favourable the attitude toward community use of school facilities.

Since families in the Hardisty Community typically have a better than average education, and a larger than average income, one would suspect from the strength of the tables regarding community use of school facilities that there would be a high participation rate in activities at the Community School. This is not the case. It appears that residents in the Hardisty community strongly favour community use of school facilities, but relatively few personally exercise their opportunity to use the school facilities.

MATTHEW HALTON COMMUNITY SCHOOL

RESULTS OF THE PINCHER CREEK SURVEY

From the data collected it is difficult to categorize Pincher Creek with respect to gross family income. There was a large (44.7%) no response rate to the income question, which renders the responses virtually meaningless.

With respect to education, three out of four respondents had successfully completed a minimum of Grade IX. This is significantly higher than the 50% Provincial average. Fifteen point four per cent (15.4%) had successfully completed a minimum of one year of university or college, this is slightly over double the 7% average for the Province.

The average family size of three (3) members is considerably smaller than the provincial average of 3.7 members.

Generally then, it can be said that the typical family, in Pincher Creek has attained a higher than average level of education, and a considerably smaller than average family.

Regarding awareness of the Matthew Halton Community School Project, 77.2% of those interviewed indicated they were aware of the Community School operation. This is a high level of awareness, possibly due in part to the fact that the Community School is operating in a small town. Of those who were aware of the project 81.9%* were familiar enough with it to be able to specifically recall a program, event or activity which had been offered by/in the Community School.

The Pincher Creek Echo, the local newspaper, was identified as the primary source of information regarding the Community School by 62.5% of the respondents who were aware of the Projects existence. The second most popular source was through a friend, 13.8%.

Over half (57.4%) of the respondents aware of the Community School were aware that there was a Community School Coordinator. Of these, two-thirds (66.1%) could personally name him.

When the respondents were asked who they would contact to participate in a program, event, or activity at the Community School most people (69%)* said that they would contact one of the teachers or the school office.

There was a high level of community awareness regarding various aspects and dimensions of Matthew Halton Community School. Over three quarters (78.7%)* of the respondents were aware that adults could attend day classes and receive credit toward their high school diploma. Interestingly, slightly fewer people

*For the remainder of this report an asterisk denotes Adjusted Frequency (i.e. Relative Frequency - Not Applicable = Adjusted Frequency)

(73.4%)* were aware that adults could receive credit toward their high school diploma for evening courses. Ninety point four per cent (90.4%)* were aware of the work experience program for the regular day students.

Slightly more than one in four (28.7%) respondents participated in a program, event, or activity offered at Matthew Halton. When those who had not participated were asked whether there was any particular reason, the most common reply (58.2%)* was "no time" or that their shift-work interfered with regular attendance of programs.

There was a high no response rate (52.2%) to the question, "What new programs would you like to see offered at Matthew Halton Community School?" However, many of the people who made no suggestions for new courses said that they were content with the courses now being offered. General interest courses, such as Chinese cooking, public speaking and the like, were advocated by 9.8% of the respondents.

There were three attitudinal questions on a seven point scale in the instrument. The points ranged from (1) strongly opposed, through (4) undecided, to (7) strongly in favour.

The first of these questions was to measure the community attitude toward Matthew Halton Community School. Three-quarters (75.6%) were strongly in favour of the Community School (i.e. they chose either (6) or (7) on the scale) with 57.7% choosing (7).

The results of the second attitudinal question, which was designed to measure attitude about the community use of school facilities, demonstrates strong support for the community use of facilities: Seventy-one point five (71.5%) strongly favoured community use of school facilities, with 46.3% choosing (7).

The community strongly supported the idea of field trips for students. Three quarters (75.6%) strongly favoured field trips, with 56.9% choosing (7). A follow up question to determine how far the residents were willing to extend these field trips showed over half (51.2%) felt that the field trips should remain in and around Pincher Creek. While 17.9% indicated field trips should remain within the Province.

There was an extremely high "no response" rate (96.7%) to an open ended question which asked the respondents what they disliked about Matthew Halton Community School. This high no response rate is not due to the residents' unfamiliarity with the Community School, since 77.2% were aware of the Community School. So it can be concluded that the resident of Pincher Creek have no significant dislikes about the Community School.

Another open-ended question asking what the residents liked about Matthew Halton Community School had a high "no response" rate (52.2%). One fifth (20.3%) mentioned that they liked the opportunity to increase their education, 13% liked the variety of courses offered at the Community School and another 13% liked the idea that the school facilities were being well utilized.

There were predictable results in a question to determine suitable times and days to participate in programs. Monday evening was the most popular, followed closely by Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursdays.

COMMENTS ON THE RURAL SAMPLE

The results for rural sample were quite similar to the results of the town sample. Two things which should be mentioned are that 87.5% of those that were aware of the Community School Project, learned of it through the Echo. This illustrates that the local newspaper is an important means of reaching the rural population. Also of interest, there was a much larger "no" response (60.8%) from the rural sector than the town (27.6%) to the question, "Are you aware that there is a Community School Coordinator at Matthew Halton?"

RESULTS OF CROSS-TABULATION

Education was the one independent variable with significant positive correlation to three dependent variables (all at the 99% confidence level) first relationship, grade completed by attitude toward the Community School, showed that the higher the grade completed the more favourable the attitude toward the Community School.

The second, grade completed by attitude about field trips, showed that the higher the grade completed the more favourable the attitude toward field trips. Finally, the third correlation, grade completed by distance of field trips, showed that the higher the education the more agreeable the respondents were to field trips which involved considerable travel, namely, beyond the Province.

It was thought that in view of these three significant relationships, there would be a similar relationship between grade completed and awareness of the Community School project. No relationship was indicated. It is therefore, difficult to put these significant relationships into the context of the entire evaluation.

ST. PAUL REGIONAL HIGH COMMUNITY SCHOOL

RESULTS OF THE ST. PAUL SURVEY

From the data collected it is difficult to categorize the the St. Paul Community with respect to annual gross family income. There was a very large (37.2%) no response rate. This renders the responses relatively meaningless.

With respect to education, 70.5% of the sample had successfully completed a minimum of Grade IX, this is significantly higher than the 50% Provincial average. Fourteen percent (14%) of the sample had successfully completed a minimum of one year of university of college, this is double the 7% Provincial average.

The average family size coincides with the Provincial average of 3.7 members.

Regarding the Trial Project, 62% of the respondents indicated that they had heard of the St. Paul Regional High Community School. Of these, 62.9%* were familiar enough with the Project to be able to specifically recall a program, event or activity which had been offered by/in the Community School.

The St. Paul Journal, the local newspaper was identified by 59.2%* of the respondents as the primary source of learning about the Project. The second most popular source (13.5%)* was through a friend.

Almost seven out of ten (69.1%)* of the respondents who were aware of the Community School were aware that there was a Community School Coordinator at St. Paul Regional High. Of these, three-quarters could personally name him.

When the respondents were asked who they would contact to participate in an activity other than the Coordinator, 47.3% said they would contact one of the teachers of the school office.

There was a high level of community awareness regarding various aspects and dimensions of St. Paul Regional High Community School. Over three quarters (76.5%)* of the respondents were aware adults could attend day classes and receive credit toward their high school diploma. The same figure applies for awareness of adults receiving credit for evening courses. Ninety three point seven (93.7%)* were aware of the work experience program for the regular day students.

*Throughout the remainder of the report an asterisk will denote Adjusted Frequency (i.e. Relative Frequency - Not Applicable = Adjusted Frequency).

Over one-third (35.7%)* of the respondent participated in a program, event, or activity offered in/by St. Paul Regional High. When those who had not participated were asked whether there was any particular reasons, the most common reply (38%)* was "no time" or that their shift-work interfered with regular attendance of programs.

There was a high no response rate (45%) to the question, "What new programs would you like to see offered at St. Paul Regional High?" However, many of the people who made no suggestions for new courses said that they were content with the courses now being offered. Language courses were advocated by 26.3%* of the respondents.

There were three attitudinal questions on a seven point scale in the instrument. The points ranged from (1) strongly opposed, through (4) undecided, to (7) strongly in favour.

The first of these questions was to measure the community attitude to St. Paul Regional High Community School. Over two-thirds (66.7%) were strongly in favour of the Community School (i.e. they chose either (6) or (7) on the scale with 37.2% choosing (7).

The second attitudinal question, which was designed to measure attitude about the community use of school facilities, demonstrates very strong support for the community use of school facilities. Three-quarters (75.2%) strongly favoured community use of school facilities; with 41.9% choosing (7).

The community strongly supported the idea of field trips for students. Over three-quarters (78.3%) strongly favoured field trips, with 51.2% choosing (7). A follow up question to determine how far the residents were willing to extend these field trips showed 40.3% agreeing to field trips beyond the Province. Over a third (36.4%) felt that the field trips should be confined to the Province. This indicates that 76.6% of the respondents agreed to field trips beyond the local community.

There was a high no response rate (55%) to an open-ended question asking what the residents liked about the Community School. Over a fifth (20.9%) said they liked the variety of courses offered at St. Paul Regional High. While 9.3% mentioned they liked the idea of having the opportunity to increase their education.

There was a high no response rate (60.5%) to another open-ended question which asked the residents what they disliked about the Community School. There were 35.7% who stated they had no dislikes. In part the high "no response" rate is due to the fact that many respondents had no dislike toward the Community School.

It can be concluded that there are no significant dislikes toward the Community School in St. Paul.

It is interesting to note that the results to the question asking for suitable times and days, showed that Wednesday evening was the most popular time, followed by Monday, Tuesday, and Thursday evenings.

RESULTS OF THE CROSS-TABULATION

There were only two tables which had significant relationships. The one table was age by awareness of a coordinator. It showed (99% confidence level) that as age increased so did the awareness of the existence of a Community School Coordinator at St. Paul Regional High. The second table, age by aware adults receive credit, showed (99% confidence level) that as age increased so did the awareness that adults received credit toward their high school diploma for some of the courses they took at the Community School.

Since age is the independent variable it could be that the local newspaper was the instrumental factor in these significant relationships. Since older people read newspapers more frequently than younger people, they could have very well read of the Community School Coordinator and the fact that adults received credit for courses in the local newspaper.

OBSERVATIONS

Community Schools respond to the needs of the communities in which they are located. In this evaluation two types of communities were involved, urban and rural. Also, there were two types of schools involved, a Junior High and two Senior High Schools.

The following are some considerations and implications of operating a Community School under the afore mentioned circumstances.

Community Schools operating in a large urban centre such as Edmonton, are restricted in the types of courses and programs they can offer. They are also restricted in the level of sophistication of these courses and programs. This is the case because so many other institutions (University, Community College, Technical Institute, etc.) offer courses and programs. A Community School in an urban centre must be careful not to duplicate courses offered by other agencies or institutions. If they offer duplicate courses they run the risk of competing with older and more popular institutions and agencies, which in most instances have more credibility than a newly started Community School. Results of such competition could be very frustrating and discouraging to the Community School.

The urban Community School has no fear of competition with established institutions and agencies in areas such as sports and fitness related activities, interest courses, and other non-credit courses. By and large residents prefer the convenience of participating in these programs close to home i.e. at the Community School.

Community Schools in rural areas can offer a broad range of courses and programs. Usually there are few, if any, institutions or agencies to compete with, consequently there is no restriction on the level of sophistication of courses and programs offered. For example, it is possible for residents of Pincher Creek and St. Paul to take some courses at the University level at their respective Community Schools.

Operating a Community School in a Junior High School has its limitations. It is difficult for a Junior High to attract adults to their credit classes either day or evening since most adults (especially in an urban centre) have completed Junior High School and therefore have no need for courses at that level.

Community Schools which operate from a high school can attract many adults who wish to complete their high school diploma. They can attend evening or day classes. There is less reluctance on behalf of the adults to attend day classes in a high school since high school students are older and generally more mature than Junior High students.

Community Schools operating in urban centres (Edmonton in particular) have a great advantage over their rural counterparts with respect to community learning resources. Listed are some of the urban resources: Legislative Building, Museum, Art Gallery, Live Theatre, Symphonies, Large Hotels, Airports, and Oil Refineries, just to name a few. A multitude of field trips or work experience programs can be established utilizing these resources.

In rural areas the informal lines of communication (the grape vine) appear most effective in increasing people's awareness of the Community School which in turn appears to effect a higher participation rate.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Hardisty Junior High Community School is operating under a double handicap. It is a Junior High, and it is addressing a community which is much too large. Actually, Hardisty is made up of six smaller communities with a combined population of 30,000 residents. Consequently community awareness of, and participation in, the Community School is relatively low.

2. Matthew Halton Community School in Pincher Creek and St. Paul Regional High Community School can be termed "successful" using community awareness and participation rates as criteria for success.
3. Pincher Creek and St. Paul offer adults in their community and opportunity to increase their education. If it were not for the Community School these adults might not enjoy that opportunity.
4. The Agreement which allows for joint use of facilities by the local Recreation Board and the local School Board has allowed an additional operational demension which contributes to the success of Community Schools.
5. Most schools in Alberta were not constructed with the aim of accommodating the community. Consequently few existing schools have the space or the facilities to accommodate regular day-time student activities and community group activities simultaneously.
6. It is necessary that Community School Coordinators have a reduced teaching load. They require a great deal of time to work in the community making and finalizing arrangements for activities held both in, and out, of the school.
7. A Community School Coordinator is essential for the operation of a successful Community School. He is an initiator, a facilitator, and a catalyst in community education.
8. For many adults the word "School" has the connotation of being a place for children only. This notion must be dispelled.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the information gathered in this evaluation the author makes the following recommendations. It should be noted that these recommendations are those of the author and not the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower.

1. High Schools rather than Junior Highs should be Community Schools. High Schools are capable of offering more dimensions to a Community School than a Junior High. In no way is this recommendation intended to discourage integration of Junior High Schools and the community.
2. Urban Community Schools should not address themselves to large communities, i.e. 30,000 people in the case of Hardisty, but rather concentrate on smaller communities of 5,000 to 7,000 people.

3. A Community School Coordinator must maintain a high profile in the community. He should be actively engaged in Community Leagues and clubs or associations.
4. A Community School Coordinator should be accessible throughout the day and evening to both the school and the community.
5. Where ever possible, a Community School Coordinator should be a resident of the community in which the community school is to operate. Familiarity with the community will increase the effectiveness of a Coordinator.
6. In the future all schools should be constructed to accommodate day student activities and community activities simultaneously. Facilities such as swimming pools, theatre auditoriums, conference rooms, lounges and eating areas should be included in these new constructions.
7. To remove the connotation of 'school' being a place for children only these new structures should not be labelled 'schools' but rather Community Centres in which the regular daytime student activities are just one of many activities occurring in the Community Centre.

APPENDIX A

This Appendix includes the questionnaires used in each of the three communities. Basically it is the same instrument for all three surveys however, there are slight modifications in the questionnaire for the Hardisty Community to reflect the nature of the Hardisty Junior High Community School.

In each of the instruments Q1, Have you heard of the Community School Project? has three possible responses, YES, NO and QUALIFIED YES. If a respondent answered NO then the interviewer read an information sheet (see next page) which briefly outlined the Community School operation. After hearing the information sheet read many respondents would say 'Oh yes, I knew they were doing that.' Such admissions were considered QUALIFIED YESSES. That is the respondents admitted they knew about the Community School but only after their memories had been assisted.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly opposed undecided strongly in favor

3

Interviewer No.

--	--	--

Street Address

Morn	Aft	Eve
------	-----	-----

[illegible]

No. of Adults in household

--	--

1. Have you heard of the St. Paul Regional High Community School Project?
Yes ____ No ____ Qualified Yes ____
(read info sheet) *If answer to Question 1 is "No" go to Question 11
2. How did you become aware of the St. Paul Regional High Community School Project?
(1) local newspaper, or other mass media ____
(2) son, daughter ____
(3) spouse ____
(4) friend ____
(5) other ____
3. Are you aware that there is a Community School Coordinator at St. Paul Regional High School?
Yes ____ No ____ *If yes can you name him? ____
If you cannot name him, who would you contact to participate in a program, event, activity etc. at St. Paul Regional High? ____
4. Did you know that you could book the Community School facilities directly through the Coordinator?
Yes ____ No ____
5. Are you aware that adults can attend classes during the day at St. Paul Regional High School?
Yes ____ No ____
6. Are you aware that regular day-time students can attend evening classes and receive credit for these classes?
Yes ____ No ____
7. Are you aware that adults, similarly, receive credit towards their high school diploma for these classes?
Yes ____ No ____
8. Can you recall any specific programs that have been, or are being offered by the Community School? If "yes" please specify.
Yes ____ (probe) No ____
9. Have you participated in any programs offered by/in the Community School?
Yes ____ No ____
If "no": Is there any particular reason?

10. Did you know that some students at St. Paul Regional High School participate in a work experience program, whereby they work in various businesses and shops in the community?
Yes ____ No ____
11. What new programs would you like to see offered? (If "no" to question 1 ask:
What kinds of programs would you like to see a Community School offer?

12. State which one of the following categories comes closest to reflecting your attitude toward a Community School (hand respondent card #1)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly opposed undecided strongly in favor

13. What do you like about St. Paul Regional High Community School?

14. What do you dislike about St. Paul Regional High Community School?

15. State which one of the following categories comes closest to reflecting your attitude about students making field trips to various points of interest within the community and surrounding area. (give respondent card #1)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly opposed undecided strongly in favor

16. How far would you extend these field trips beyond the school?

- (1) Beyond Province _____ (4) Edmonton City _____
 (2) don't agree to field trips _____ (5) Province of Alberta _____
 (3) local community _____

17. State which one of the following categories comes closest to reflecting your attitude about community groups or individuals using the Community School facilities.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly undecided strongly
opposed in favor

18. If you were to take a course or participate in a program at the Community School, what times and what days would be most suitable to you?

Time of Day: (a) Morning _____ (b) Afternoon _____ (c) Evening _____

Day of Week: Sunday ____ Monday ____ Tuesday ____ Wednesday ____ Thursday ____
Friday ____ Saturday ____

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENT

19. Are you presently employed? Yes No Retired

If "yes" - Occupation/role (probe) _____

20. Age category (give card #2 to respondent)

(a) _____ (b) _____ (c) _____ (d) _____ (e) _____ (f) _____ (g) _____ (h) _____ (i) _____ (j) _____

21. Sex: Male Female

22. Annual gross family income (give card #3 to respondent)

(a) _____ (b) _____ (c) _____ (d) _____ (e) _____ (f) _____ (g) _____

23. Marital Status: Married _____ Single _____ Other _____

24. Number of dependents in household ____

25. Education:

Highest grade of elementary or secondary school completed

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	----	----

University and College	1	2	3	4	5	6+ years
------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------

Technical Institute 1 2 3 + years

Other Training (technical/vocational/etc.) please specify

26. Do you have any additional comments to make about the St. Paul Regional High Community School?

12. State which one of the following numbers comes closest to reflecting your attitude toward a Community School (hand respondent card #1)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly opposed undecided strongly in favor

13. What do you like about Matthew Halton Community School ?

14. What do you dislike about Matthew Halton Community School ?

15. State which one of the following numbers comes closest to reflecting your attitude about students making field trips to various points of interest within the community and surrounding area. (give respondent card #1)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly opposed undecided strongly in favor

16. How far would you extend these field trips beyond the school?

(1) don't agree to field trips _____ (4) Province of Alberta _____
(2) local community _____ (5) beyond Province _____
(3) Edmonton City _____

17. State which one of the following numbers comes closest to reflecting your attitude about community groups or individuals using the Community School facilities.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly undecided strongly
opposed in favor

18. If you were to take a course or participate in a program at the Community School, what times and what days would be most suitable to you?

Time of Day: (a) Morning ____ (b) Afternoon ____ (c) Evening ____
Day of Week: Sunday ____ Monday ____ Tuesday ____ Wednesday ____ Thursday ____
Friday ____ Saturday ____

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENT

19. Are you presently employed? Yes No Retired

If "yes" - Occupation/role (probe) _____

20. Age category (give card #2 to respondent)

(a) _____ (b) _____ (c) _____ (d) _____ (e) _____ (f) _____ (g) _____ (h) _____ (i) _____ (j) _____

21. Sex: Male Female

22. Annual gross family income (give card #3 to respondent)

(a) _____ (b) _____ (c) _____ (d) _____ (e) _____ (f) _____ (g) _____

23. Marital Status: Married _____ Single _____ Other _____

24. Number of dependents in household ____

25. Education:

Highest grade of elementary or secondary school completed

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

University and College	1	2	3	4	5	6+ years
------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------

Technical Institute 1 2 3 + years

Other Training (technical/vocational/etc.) please specify

26. Do you have any additional comments to make about the Matthew Walton Community School ?

© 2016 Pearson Education, Inc. or its affiliate(s). All rights reserved.

APPENDIX B

RESULTS OF THE COMMUNITY SURVEYS

The relative frequencies and, in parenthesis, adjusted frequencies for the three community surveys are listed below. The urban (Hardisty) results appear first, then the rural (Pincher Creek and St. Paul).

HARDISTY SURVEY

Number of Calls

N.R.	1	2	3
20.6%	54.8%	19.3%	5.3%

Time of Interviews

N.R.	Morning	Afternoon	Evening
19.9%	4.0%	47.5%	28.6%

Dwelling Type

N.R.	20.3%
Single House	72.8%
Duplex	1.0%
Apartment	5.6%
Mobile Home	----
Other	0.3%

Number of Adults in Household

N.R.	1	2	3	4	5	6
16.3%	4.3%	56.1%	16.6%	4.7%	1.3%	0.7%

Q1. Have you heard of the Hardisty Community School Project?

N.R.	Yes	No	Qualified Yes
15.3%	19.3%	54.5%	11.0%

Q2. How did you become aware of the Hardisty Community School Project?

N.R.	15.3%	(33.5%)
Area 13 News	17.3%	(37.9%)
Edmonton Journal	2.0%	(4.3%)
Local Television	0.3%	(0.7%)
Son, daughter	5.6%	(12.4%)
Spouse	3.0%	(6.5%)
Friend	1.3%	(2.9%)
Through Hardisty School	0.7%	(1.4%)
Other	-	
N.A.	54.5%	

Q3. Are you aware that there is a Community School Coordinator at Hardisty Junior High?

N.R.	15.3%	(35.6%)
Yes	12.3%	(27.0%)
No	17.9%	(39.4%)
N.A.	54.5%	

If "Yes" can you name him?

N.R.	15.3%	(55.5%)
Yes	4.0%	(14.4%)
No	8.3%	(30.1%)
N.A.	72.4%	

If you cannot name him who would you contact to participate in a program?

N.R.	27.6%	(65.4%)
Contact School	10.0%	(24.0%)
Contact Teacher,		
Principal	4.0%	(9.6%)
N.A.	58.5%	

Q4. Did you know that you could book the Hardisty Community School facilities directly through the Coordinator?

N.R.	15.3%	(33.6%)
Yes	8.0%	(17.5%)
No	22.3%	(48.9%)
N.A.	54.5%	

Q5. Can you recall any specific programs, events, activities, etc., that have been or are being offered by/in Hardisty Community School?

N.R.	15.3%	(33.7%)
Yes	15.9%	(35.0%)
No	14.3%	(31.3%)
N.A.	54.5%	

If "Yes" please specify (number of courses).

N.R.	15.9%	(51.5%)
1	7.6%	(24.5%)
2	5.3%	(17.0%)
3	1.7%	(5.3%)
4	0.3%	(1.5%)
5	0.3%	(1.5%)
N.A.	68.8%	

Q6. Have you participated in or attended any programs, events, activities, etc. at Hardisty Community School?

N.R.	15.3%	(33.7%)
Yes	12.0%	(26.2%)
No	18.3%	(40.1%)
N.A.	54.5%	

If "Yes" was it: school sponsored?

N.R.	15.6%	(57.4%)
Yes	9.0%	(32.9%)
No	2.7%	(9.7%)
N.A.	72.8%	

community sponsored?

N.R.	15.6%	(57.5%)
Yes	6.6%	(24.3%)
No	5.0%	(18.2%)
N.A.	72.8%	

If "No" is there any particular reason?

N.R.	19.9%	(58.8%)
No time, shift work	5.3%	(15.6%)
No interest	3.0%	(8.8%)
No reason	1.7%	(4.9%)
Too old	0.3%	(0.9%)
No children	1.7%	(4.9%)
N.A.	66.1%	

Q7. Do you favour parents and other adult members of the community being involved to some extent in determining or initiating school policies, programs, events, activities, etc.

N.R.	15.3%	(33.6%)
Yes	28.9%	(63.5%)
No	1.3%	(2.9%)
N.A.	54.5%	

Q8. Generally do you believe the term (concept) "community school" means:
(see card #1)

N.R.	16.3%	(35.8%)
A	4.0%	(8.7%)
B	0.3%	(0.7%)
C	5.3%	(11.7%)
D	2.0%	(4.3%)
E	17.6%	(38.6%)
N.A.	54.5%	

Q9. What new programs would you like to see offered?

N.R.	33.6%	(61.9%)
Performing Arts	0.3%	(0.6%)
Ceramics, Crafts	4.7%	(8.5%)
Vocational	0.3%	(0.6%)
Languages	0.7%	(1.2%)
General Interest	2.0%	(3.7%)
Teen Programs	2.7%	(4.9%)
Fitness	10.0%	(18.4%)
N.A.	45.8%	

If "No" to Q1. What kinds of programs would you like Hardisty Community School to offer?

N.R.	29.9%	(47.8%)
Performing Arts	3.2%	(4.9%)
Ceramics, Crafts	7.0%	(11.4%)
Vocational	0.3%	(0.5%)
Languages	0.3%	(0.5%)
General Interest	2.7%	(4.4%)
Teen Programs	1.0%	(1.6%)
Fitness	17.6%	(28.8%)
N.A.	38.9%	

Q10 Attitude toward the Community School.

	Strongly Opposed				Strongly in Favour			
N.R.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
14.6%	0.7%	0.7%	0.3%	21.9%	9.6%	16.3%	35.9%	

Q11. What do you like about Hardisty Community School?

N.R.	72.8%
Variety of courses	2.0%
Night classes for adults	1.0%
Use of facilities	17.3%
Opportunity to increase education	1.0%
Good for community	5.3%

Q12. What do you dislike about Hardisty Community School?

N.R.	69.1%
Lack of information	3.0%
No dislikes	6.6%
Drop-in Centre	17.9%
Damage to school	2.3%
Distance from school	1.0%

Q13. Attitude about field trips.

	Strongly Opposed				Strongly in favour			
N.R.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
4.7%	0.3%	-	0.7%	6.0%	9.3%	16.3%	62.8%	

Q14. How far would you extend these field trips beyond the school?

N.R.	1.0%	(1.1%)
Disagree with field trips	1.0%	(1.1%)
Local community	0.7%	(0.8%)
Edmonton City	15.9%	(18.4%)
Province of Alberta	31.2%	(36.1%)
Beyond the Province	36.5%	(42.3%)

Q15. Attitude about community use of school facilities.

	Strongly Opposed					Strongly in Favour		
N.R.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1.7%	0.7%	-	0.7%	14.6%	13.0%	21.6%	47.8%	

Q16. Suitable times and days to participate in programs.

	Sun.	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thur.	Fri.	Sat.
Morning	0.3%	3.7%	3.3%	4.3%	3.0%	2.7%	2.0%
Afternoon	2.3%	7.6%	9.0%	8.6%	5.3%	6.0%	14.3%
Evening	16.3%	41.9%	42.2%	47.2%	38.5%	31.2%	8.0%
N.R.	81.1%	46.8%	45.5%	39.9%	53.2%	60.1%	75.7%

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENT

Q17. Employed.

N.R.	1.3%
Yes	48.5%
No	45.2%
Retired	5.0%

Occupation categories according to CCDO classification.

N.R.	1.7%	57	0.7%
N.A.	31.9%	61	4.7%
11	3.3%	66	0.3%
21	0.3%	74	3.3%
23	0.3%	77	3.3%
27	2.3%	82	0.3%
31	3.3%	83	0.7%
37	0.3%	85	1.0%
41	12.6%	87	2.7%
44	9.6%	89	12.0%
47	0.3%	91	2.0%
51	2.7%	99	2.3%

Q18. Age.

N.R.	10.0%
18-24 yrs.	16.3%
25-39 yrs.	28.9%
40-59 yrs.	25.2%
60+ yrs.	19.6%

Q19. Sex.

Male	28%
Female	71%
N.R.	1%

Q20. Gross annual family income.

N.R.	16.3%
Under \$10,000	11.3%
\$10,000-\$20,000	46.5%
Over \$20,000	25.2%

Q21. Marital Status.

N.R.	2.7%
Married	80.7%
Single	12.6%
Other	4.0%

Q22. Number of dependents in household.

N.R.	13.6%	4	7.0%
0	24.9%	5	1.0%
1	17.9%	6	0.3%
2	21.6%	7	0.3%
3	13.3%		

Q23. Education.

N.R.	1.0%
1-6 yrs.	0.7%
7-8 yrs.	4.7%
9-10 yrs.	13.0%
11-13 yrs.	79.7%
N.A.	1.0%

University and College.

N.R.	1.0%
1-2 yrs.	10.0%
3 yrs.	5.0%
4 yrs.	3.0%
5+ yrs.	2.7%
N.A.	78.4%

Technical Institute.

N.R.	1.0%
1 yr.	2.3%
2 yrs.	2.3%
3+ yrs.	3.0%
N.A.	91.4%

Other Training.

N.R.	5.7%
Yes	14.6%
N.A.	79.7%

Q24. Additional comments.

N.R.	82.4%
Good program.	6.6%
Would like more information.	8.0%
Should separate groups by age.	1.2%
Start senior citizens club.	1.8%

PINCHER CREEK AND ST. PAUL SURVEYS

Number of Calls

Location	Number of Calls			
	N.R.	1	2	3
Pincher Creek	9.8%	69.9%	14.6%	5.7%
St. Paul	34.1%	50.4%	12.4%	3.1%

Time of Interview

Location	Time of Interview			
	N.R.	Morn- ing	After- noon	Even- ing
Pincher Creek	11.4%	26.0%	29.3%	33.3%
St. Paul	14.0%	3.1%	27.9%	55.0%

Type of Dwelling

Location	Type of Dwelling					
	N.R.	Single House	Duplex	Apart- ment	Mobile Home	Other
Pincher Creek	2.4%	86.2%	3.3%	2.4%	4.1%	1.6%
St. Paul	3.1%	86.0%	2.3%	0.8%	2.3%	5.4%

Number of Adults

Location	Number of Adults in Household							
	N.R.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Pincher Creek	0.8%	17.1%	64.2%	12.2%	4.1%	1.6%	-	-
St. Paul	24.0%	7.8%	47.3%	10.1%	7.0%	1.6%	-	2.3%

Q1. Have you heard of the Community School Project ?

Location	Heard of Community School Project			
	N.R.	Yes	No	Qualified Yes
Pincher Creek	-	62.6%	22.8%	14.6%
St. Paul	0.8%	49.6%	37.2%	12.4%

Q2. How did you become aware of the Community School ?

Location	Means of Awareness						
	N.R.	Local Media	Son/Dau.	Spouse	Friend	Other	NA
Pincher Creek	4.9% (6.4%)	48.0% (62.5%)	6.5% (8.5%)	0.8% (1.1%)	10.6% (13.8%)	5.7% (7.5%)	23.6%
St. Paul	0.8% (1.2%)	37.2% (59.2%)	7.8% (12.4%)	0.8% (1.2%)	8.5% (13.5%)	7.8% (12.4%)	37.2%

Q3. Are you aware that there is a Community School Coordinator ?

Location	Awareness of Coordinator			
	N.R.	Yes	No	N.A.
Pincher Creek	4.9% (6.4%)	43.9% (57.4%)	27.6% (36.2%)	23.6%
St. Paul	0.8% (1.2%)	43.4% (69.1%)	18.6% (29.6%)	37.2%

If "Yes" can you name him ?

Location	Can name coordinator			
	N.R.	Yes	No	N.A.
Pincher Creek	4.9% (10.2%)	31.7% (66.1%)	11.4% (23.7%)	52.0%
St. Paul	0.8% (1.8%)	33.3% (75.5%)	10.1% (22.8%)	55.8%

If you cannot name him who would you contact to participate in a program, event activity, etc.

Location	Who to Contact to Participate				
	N.R.	Don't know	Contact School	Contact Teacher, Principal	N.A.
Pincher Creek	13.0% (29.1%)	0.8% (1.8%)	12.2% (27.3%)	18.7% (41.8%)	55.3%
St. Paul	14.0% (47.4%)	1.6% (5.3%)	5.4% (18.4%)	8.5% (29.0%)	70.5%

Q4. Did you know you could book the Community facilities directly through the Coordinator ?

Location	Aware you could book facilities through Coordinator			
	N.R.	Yes	No	N.A.
Pincher Creek	4.9% (6.4%)	29.3% (38.3%)	42.3% (55.3%)	23.6%
St. Paul	0.8% (1.2%)	38.0% (60.5%)	24.0% (38.3%)	37.2%

Q5. Are you aware that adults can attend classes during the day ?

Location	Aware Adults attend day classes			
	N.R.	Yes	No	N.A.
Pincher Creek	5.7% (7.5%)	52.0% (78.7%)	18.7% (13.8%)	23.6%
St. Paul	0.8% (1.2%)	48.1% (76.5%)	14.0% (22.2%)	37.2%

Q6. Are you aware that regular day time students can attend evening classes and receive credit for these classes ? (Applicable to Pincher Creek only.)

Location	N.R.	Yes	No	N.A.
Pincher Creek	5.7% (7.5%)	52.0% (68.1%)	18.7% (24.4%)	23.6%

- Q7. Are you aware that adults similarly receive credit towards their high school diploma for these classes ?

Location	Aware Adults Receive Credit for Classes			
	N.R.	Yes	No	N.A.
Pincher Creek	4.9% (6.4%)	56.1% (73.4%)	15.4% (20.2%)	23.6%
St. Paul	1.6% (2.4%)	48.1% (76.5%)	13.2% (21.1%)	37.2%

- Q8. Can you recall any specific programs that have been, or are being offered by the Community School?

Location	Recall any Specific Programs			
	N.R.	Yes	No	N.A.
Pincher Creek	4.9% (6.4%)	62.5% (81.9%)	8.9% (11.7%)	23.6%
St. Paul	2.3% (3.7%)	39.5% (62.9%)	20.9% (33.4%)	37.2%

If "yes" please specify (number of courses)

Location	Number of Courses						N.A.
	N.R.	1	2	3	4	5	
Pincher Creek	6.5% (9.8%)	26.0% (39.0%)	12.3% (18.3%)	10.6% (15.9%)	7.3% (11.0%)	4.1% (6.1%)	33.5%
St. Paul	3.1% (7.6%)	14.7% (35.9%)	12.4% (30.1%)	8.5% (20.8%)	0.8% (1.9%)	1.6% (3.8%)	58.9%

- Q9. Have you participated in any programs offered in/by the Community School ?

Location	Participated			
	N.R.	Yes	No	N.A.
Pincher Creek	4.9% (6.4%)	22.0% (28.7%)	49.6% (64.9%)	23.6%
St. Paul	2.3% (3.7%)	22.5% (35.8%)	38.0% (60.5%)	37.2%

If "no" is there any particular reason ?

Location	Reason for not Participating					
	N.R.	No Time Shift Wrk.	No Interest	No Reason	Handi-capped	N.A.
Pincher Creek	12.2% (19.4%)	31.7% (58.2%)	4.9% (9.0%)	3.3% (6.0%)	2.4% (4.5%)	45.5%
St. Paul	6.2% (15.4%)	15.5% (38.0%)	2.3% (5.8%)	10.9% (26.9%)	5.5% (13.5%)	59.7%

Q10 Did you know that some students participate in a work experience program ?

Location	Know about Work Experience Program			
	N.R.	Yes	No	N.A.
Pincher Creek	4.9% (6.4%)	69.1% (90.4%)	2.4% (3.2%)	23.6%
St. Paul	1.6% (2.5%)	58.9% (93.7%)	2.3% (3.8%)	37.2%

Q11 What new programs would you like to see offered ?

Location	New Programs							
	N.R.	Performing Arts	Ceramics, Crafts	Vocational	Languages	General Interest	Business	N.A.
Pincher Creek	52.2% (69.2%)	4.1% (5.3%)	1.6% (2.1%)	1.6% (2.1%)	4.9% (6.4%)	9.8% (12.8%)	1.6% (2.1%)	23.6%
St. Paul	45.0% (71.6%)	0.8% (1.2%)	1.6% (2.4%)	3.9% (6.1%)	4.7% (7.4%)	3.9% (6.1%)	3.1% (4.9%)	37.2%

If "no" to Q1: What kinds of programs would you like to see a Community School Offer ?

Location	What Programs Should Community School Offer							
	N.R.	Driver Ed.	Ceramics, Crafts	Vocational	Languages	General Interest	Business	N.A.
Pincher Creek	17.9% (75.9%)	-	1.6% (6.9%)	1.6% (6.9%)	-	1.6% (6.9%)	0.8% (3.5%)	76.4%
St. Paul	32.6% (85.7%)	0.8% (2.0%)	0.8% (2.0%)	1.6% (4.0%)	0.8% (2.0%)	0.8% (2.0%)	0.8% (2.0%)	62.0%

Q12 Attitude toward Community School.

Location	Attitude							
	N.R.	Strongly Opposed	Unde- cided					Strongly in favor
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Pincher Creek	2.4%	0.8%	1.6%	-	9.8%	9.8%	17.9%	57.7%
St. Paul	3.1%	-	-	1.6%	21.7%	7.0%	29.5%	37.2%

Q13 What do you like about (Matthew Halton Community School)?
(St. Paul Regional High Community School)?

Location	Likes					
	N.R.	Variety of Courses	Night Classes	Use of Facilities	Opportunity to Increase Education	Good for Town
Pincher Creek	52.0%	13.0%	0.8%	13.0%	20.9%	-
St. Paul	55.8%	20.9%	3.1%	5.4%	9.3%	5.4%

Q14 What do you dislike about (Matthew Halton Community School)?
(St. Paul Regional High Community School)?

Location	Dislikes			
	N.R.	Lack of Infor.	No Dislikes	Not enough Univ. Courses
Pincher Creek	96.7%	1.6%	0.8%	0.8%
St. Paul	62.1%	2.3%	35.7%	

Q15 Attitude about field trips.

Location	Attitude About Field Trips							
	N.R.	Strongly Opposed	Unde- cided					Strongly in favor
			1	2	3	4	5	
Pincher Creek	3.3%	-	0.8%	-	9.8%	10.6%	18.7%	56.9%
St. Paul	3.9%	0.8%	-	0.8%	9.3%	7.0%	27.1%	51.2%

Q16 How far would you extend these field trips beyond the school ?

Location	Distance of Field Trips					
	N.R.	Disagree to Field trips	Local Community	Edmonton City	Prov. of Alberta	Beyond Province
Pincher Creek	8.1%	0.8%	20.3%	1.6%	17.9%	51.2%
St. Paul	4.7%	3.1%	7.0%	8.5%	36.4%	40.3%

Q17 Attitude about community use of school facilities.

Location	Attitude							
	N.R.	Strongly Opposed			Undecided			Strongly in Favor
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Pincher Creek	4.1%	0.8%	-	-	14.6%	8.9%	25.2%	46.3%
St. Paul	3.1%	1.6%	0.8%	2.3%	10.9%	6.2%	33.3%	41.9%

Q18 Suitable times and days to participate in programs.

PINCHER CREEK

	Sun day	Mon	Tues	Wed	Thur	Fri	Sat
Morning	-	2.4%	3.3%	-	0.8%	-	-
Afternoon	2.4%	6.5%	4.9%	4.9%	4.1%	3.3%	1.6%
Evening	10.6%	37.4%	23.6%	28.5%	24.4%	14.6%	11.4%
N.R.	87.0%	53.7%	68.2%	66.6%	70.7%	82.1%	87.0%

ST. PAUL

	Sun day	Mon	Tues	Wed	Thur	Fri	Sat
Morning	2.3%	3.9%	4.7%	6.2%	2.3%	2.3%	0.8%
Afternoon	3.1%	1.6%	0.8%	4.7%	1.6%	0.8%	0.8%
Evening	0.8%	29.5%	27.9%	32.6%	26.4%	14.7%	6.0%
N.R.	93.8%	64.3%	65.9%	55.0%	68.2%	80.6%	91.5%

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENTS

Q19 Employed

Location	Employed			
	N.R.	Yes	No	Retired
Pincher Creek	3.3%	46.3%	30.1%	20.3%
St. Paul	1.6%	60.5%	20.2%	17.8%

Occupation categories according to C.C.D.O. classifications

Pincher Creek

N.R.	4.9%
N.A.	51.2%
11	2.4%
14	0.7%
27	3.3%
31	3.3%
41	4.1%
51	0.8%
61	3.3%
71	7.3%
77	2.4%
82	0.8%
87	4.9%
89	2.4%
91	1.6%
95	1.6%
99	4.9%

St. Paul

N.R.	13.2%
N.A.	34.1%
11	6.2%
23	1.6%
27	4.7%
31	0.8%
33	1.6%
41	14.7%
51	0.8%
61	4.7%
71	1.6%
82	1.6%
85	1.6%
87	2.3%
89	3.9%
91	2.3%
95	0.8%
99	3.1%

Q20 Age

Location	Age				
	18-24 yrs.	25-39 yrs.	40-59 yrs.	60+ yrs.	N.R.
Pincher Creek	7.3%	16.3%	39.0%	28.5%	8.9%
St. Paul	7.0%	27.1%	35.7%	23.3%	7.0%

Q21 Sex .

Location	Sex		
	Male	Female	N.R.
Pincher Creek	39.8%	59.3%	-
St. Paul	43.4%	54.3%	2.3%

Q22 Annual gross family income.

Location	Annual Gross Family Income			
	Under \$10,000	\$10,000 to \$20,000	Over \$20,000	N.R.
Pincher Creek	15.4%	25.2%	14.6%	44.7%
St. Paul	20.9%	33.3%	8.5%	37.2%

Q23 Marital Status.

Location	Marital Status			
	Married	Single	Other	N.R.
Pincher Creek	77.2%	4.9%	12.2%	5.7%
St. Paul	79.8%	14.7%	3.9%	1.6%

Q24 Number of dependents in household.

Location	Number of Dependents								N.R.
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Pincher Creek	35.7%	17.1%	22.8%	13.0%	3.3%	2.4%	0.8%	-	4.9%
St. Paul	20.9%	18.6%	16.3%	11.6%	8.5%	3.9%	2.3%	1.6%	16.3%

Q25 Education

Location	Education					
	N.R.	1-6 yrs	7-8 yrs	9-10 yrs	11-13 yrs	N.A.
Pincher Creek	4.1%	4.9%	12.2%	19.5%	56.9%	2.4%
St. Paul	3.9%	2.3%	20.2%	21.7%	48.8%	2.3%

University and College

Location	University & College					
	N.R.	1-2 yrs	3 yrs	4 yrs	5+ yrs	N.A.
Pincher Creek	4.1%	8.1%	1.6%	4.1%	1.6%	80.5%
St. Paul	3.9%	7.0%	-	5.4%	1.6%	81.4%

Technical Institute

Location	Technical Institute				
	N.R.	1 yr	2 yrs	3 yrs	N.A.
Pincher Creek	4.9%	8.9%	0.8%	1.6%	83.7%
St. Paul	3.9%	2.3%	1.6%	-	92.2%

Other Training

Location	Other Training		
	N.R.	Yes	N.A.
Pincher Creek	4.9%	11.9%	83.7%
St. Paul	8.2%	9.1%	82.7%

Q26 Additional Comments

Location	Additional Comments		
	N.R.	Good Program	Need more Information
Pincher Creek	74.0%	25.2%	0.8%
St. Paul	78.6%	21.1%	0.3%

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Future of Choices A Choice of Futures. Report of the Commission of Educational Planning, Walter H. Worth, Commissioner. Edmonton: Queen's Printer, 1972.

BERRIDGE, Robert I. The Community Education Handbook. Midland Michigan: Pendell Publishing Co., 1973.

CAP, Orest. "Co-operative Education". Education Canada, Spring 1975.

Community/School: Sharing the Space and Action. A report from Educational Facilities Laboratories, New York: 1973.

DEAN, David H. Community Schools in Rural Areas. Mott Institute for Community Improvement: Michigan State University, 1974.

DECKER, Larry E. Foundations of Community Education. Midland Michigan: Pendell Publishing Co., 1972.

DECKER, Larry E. "Community Education, Purpose, Function, Growth, Potential." Leisure Today, April 1974.

HERMAN, B.E. "Community School: New Thrust in Education." Educational Leadership, January 1971.

HOVIS, Watson B. "Community Education: Supply and Demand, Information, Evaluation." Leisure Today, April 1974.

KOLMES, Jo-Anne. "A Cooperative Venture in Learning" Alberta Teacher's Association Magazine, May-June 1975.

LEMIRE, Jean-Marc. Langevin Community-School Project of Calgary: An Evaluative Study. Edmonton: Government of the Province of Alberta, Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation, 1972.

MIDWINTER, Eric. Patterns of Community Education. London, England: Ward Lock Educational, 1973.

MINZEY, Jack D. "Community Education - Another Perception." Community Education Journal, May-June 1974.

MINZEY, Jack D. "Community Education: The Facilitator For Others To Do Their Thing." Leisure Today, April 1974.

PINKNEY, Wayne. "An Experiment In School - Community Cooperation." A.T.A. Magazine, May-June 1972.

Share It! Some Approaches to the Joint use of Community Facilities. Information Bulletin jointly published by the Alberta Department of Education and the Alberta Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation.

STEVENS, Jack. "Community Schools" Education Canada, December 1974.

WARDEN, John W. "Guidelines for Evaluating the Community Education Process." Community Education Journal, Sept. 1973.

Year-Round Community Schools, A Framework for Administrative Leadership. Arlington, Virginia: Published by American Association of School Administrators, 1973.

INFORMATION SHEET

The (Matthew Halton, Hardisty, St. Paul Regional) Community School Project is an attempt to integrate the Community and the School. This will be achieved in many ways. One being; the Community participating in various credit and non-credit courses, offered both during the day and evening. Another way is by the Community making use of school facilities, such as: classrooms, assembly rooms, shops and gymnasias. While for the school, this integration can be achieved by getting out into the community and studying it firsthand. Beyond this the school can make use of community facilities such as parks, museums, art galleries, the Legislative building, hospitals, courts, etc.

The integration of Community and School can be a most meaningful and enjoyable learning experience for all concerned.

Information Sheet

The Hardisty Community School Project is an attempt to integrate the Community and the School. This will be achieved in many ways. One being; the Community participating in various programs, events, activities, etc., offered both during the day and evening. Another way is by the Community making use of school facilities, such as: classrooms, assembly rooms, shops, and gymnasias. While for the school, this integration can be achieved by getting out into the community and studying it firsthand. Beyond this the school can make use of community facilities such as parks, museums, art galleries, the legislative building, hospitals, courts, etc.

Overall the community school attempts to draw the community into a closer relationship with the school and conversely draw the school into a closer relationship with the community. As outlined previously, this is achieved by utilization of various modes of communication, and various programs, activities and events.

